UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| | |
|---|---|
| ALEC S. COSTERUS,<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>v.<br><br>BARRY NEAL, TIMOTHY LANDERS, PETER HOLMAN, JOHN KENNEDY, LEONARD J. WETHERBEE, and THE TOWN OF CONCORD,<br><br>Defendants. | 00-CV-12156-MEL |

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

LASKER, D.J.

Alec Costerus alleges that the defendants violated his state and federal constitutional rights to store and possess firearms on March 21, 1999. There are three motions before the Court. They are disposed of as follows:

1. The Town of Concord's Motion to Compel Documents from Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's Insufficient Response to Town of Concord's First Request for Documents

The Town of Concord moves to compel Costerus to produce the documents it has asked for in Requests 1, 2, and 8 of Defendant Town of Concord's First Request for Documents from Plaintiff. Costerus objects.

The motion to compel is DENIED as to Requests 1 and 2, but GRANTED as to Request 8.

92

2. The Town of Concord's Motion to Compel Further Responses from the Pro Se Plaintiff Regarding the Pro Se Plaintiff's Answers to Concord's First Set of Interrogatories

The Town of Concord moves to compel Costerus to answer Interrogatories 15, 16, and 18-22 in Defendant Town of Concord's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff. Costerus objects.

The motion to compel is GRANTED. However, with regard to Interrogatory 16, Costerus may respond, if it is true, that he did not make the threat implicitly assumed in the question, or otherwise qualify his response to conform to the facts as he understands them. Further, although Costerus shall answer Interrogatories 18-22, the defendants shall be careful not to abuse their right to ask interrogatories by subjecting Costerus to an unnecessarily burdensome volume of questions.

3. Peter Holman's Motion to Compel Further Responses from the Pro Se Plaintiff Regarding the Pro Se Plaintiff's Answers to Holman's First Set of Interrogatories

Defendant Holman moves to compel Costerus to answer more completely Interrogatory 2 in Defendant Holman's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff. Costerus objects.

The motion to compel is DENIED on the ground that Costerus has represented that he cannot remember any additional detail beyond what he has already provided.

* * *

It is so ordered.

Dated: July 25, 2002
Boston, Massachusetts

United States District Judge